

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable consideration of this application, as presently amended, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-40 are pending. Claims 1, 8, 10, and 15 are amended. Claims 19-25 and 32-40 are withdrawn. Support is deemed to be evident from the original claims. Thus, no new subject matter is added.

The specification has also been amended to include section headings. Applicants submit these headings also introduce no new subject matter.

At items 2-3, the Office Action rejects claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2 as indefinite due to recitation of copper. More specifically, the Office Action asserts that the recitation of copper in claim 8 is not possible because “the claims require that there is not copper.” Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Independent claim 1, on which claim 8 depends, does not exclude all copper. Instead, independent claim 1 expressly recites “no copper layer.” Thus, the claims do not exclude some amount of copper so long as it does not constitute a copper layer as understood by those of ordinary skill in this art. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the objection to claim 8 has been overcome.

At items 4 and 5, the Office Action rejects claims 1-2, 6, 12-13, and 17-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Servais et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,894,278). Specifically, the Office Action asserts that Servais et al. discloses a mirror composed of a glass sheet with a silver coating formed thereon, a layer of nickel, and a paint layer. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of the amended claims over Servais et al.

Amended independent claim 1 recites a mirror including a glass substrate, a silver coating layer provided at a surface of the glass substrate, at least one material selected from the group consisting of Pd, Eu, Pt, Ru, Na, Zr, Y and Rh (but not Ni) provided at a surface of

the silver coating layer which is adjacent to a paint layer, and at least one paint layer covering the silver coating layer. Amended claim 1 further recites that the mirror has no copper layer.

By contrast, Servais et al. is directed towards a decorative mirror with nickel in some locations in the structure. As noted above, however, amended claim 1 no longer recites nickel and Servais et al. neither discloses nor suggests the other materials recited at the surface of the silver coating layer adjacent to the paint layer. Thus, Servais et al. does not anticipate amended claim 1.

Accordingly, Servais et al. does not disclose or suggest the features of independent claim 1. It is submitted that independent claim 1, and dependent claims 2-9 and 11-18 which depend on claim 1, are in condition for allowance.

At items 6-8, the Office Action rejects claims 1-18 and 26-31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over Laroche et al. Specifically, the Office Action states that Laroche et al. discloses various materials including Pd, Ni, Pt, Ru and Rh to increase the adhesion of the silver coating and increase durability. The Office Action then concludes that because some of the materials for promoting adhesion at the silver/glass interface are the same as those recited in the presently claimed silver/paint interface, it would have been obvious to use the same materials in subsequent layers. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection over Laroche et al.

Laroche et al. discloses a process for forming a silver layer on a very particular type of substrate, a vitreous substrate. See, abstract, col. 1, lines 9-11. Thus, Laroche et al. is directed towards the specific activating step for preparing the glass to be coated with the silver layer. Laroche et al. does not disclose or suggest that the technique used for activating a glass substrate would also be useful between the silver layer and paint layer, which does not include a vitreous substrate. In fact, Laroche et al. also addresses the layers above the silver layer and discloses that the silver layer can be coated with paint (col. 4, lines 42-50).

Conspicuous by its absence, however, is any suggestion in Laroche et al. that the claimed elements should be inserted at the silver layer/paint interface. Similarly, although traditional protective layers of copper or tin based compositions are disclosed between the silver and the paint in the Laroche et al. examples, none of the examples use the recited elements at the silver/paint interface. Consequently, there would be no reason for a person of ordinary skill in the art to include Pd, Ni, Pt, Ru or Rh between the silver and paint layer as recited in claim 1, or Pd as recited in claim 10.

Accordingly, Laroche et al. does not disclose or suggest the features of independent claims 1 and 10. It is submitted that independent claims 1 and 10, and dependent claims 2-9 and 11-18 which depend on claim 1, and dependent claims 26-32 which depend on claim 10, are in condition for allowance.

For the reasons discussed above, no further issues are believed to be outstanding in the present application, and the present application is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. Therefore, a Notice of Allowance for claims 1-18 and 26-32 is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner deem that any further action is necessary to place this application in even better form for allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P.



---

Andrew M. Ollis  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 40,749